

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
June 22, 2002 – Minutes**

Attendees:

Mark Price	Alpine
Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Richard Whitaker	Boulevard
Tim McMaster	Crest/Dehesa
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Pat Brown	Julian
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Randy Lenac	Lake Morena/Campo
Bull Huskey	Pine Valley
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Joe Chisholm	Pala-Pauma
Jesse Valentine	Rainbow
Dutch van Dierendonck	Ramona
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	VDO

Visitors:

Rick Smith
Carol Leone
Joan Kearney
Keith Behner
Phil Teyssier
Julie Bugbee
Mary Allison
Bruce Graves
Hank Palmer
Sandra Farrell
Charlene Ayers

Planning Commissioners:

Michael Beck

Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Rosemary Rowan (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Howard Blackson (DPLU)
Dixie Switzer (DPLU)

Meeting Commenced on Saturday, June 22, 2001, at 9:00am

J. Ferguson read the Spring Valley Community Planning Group Recommendation Motion Form, dated June 11, 2002. See attached document A.

M. Beck asked for a moment of silence out of respect and reverence for Mr. George Vanek, former Alpine Community Planning Group chairman who passed away recently.

Motion: J. Phillips complimented staff on the previous meeting minutes, and moved for an approval. Seconded by Dutch Van Dierendonck. No oppositions. Minutes passed unanimously.

First Agenda Item: Regional Categories

I. Holler announced that we would start with an overview of the mail out, and Planner Rosemary Rowan would make a presentation. See attached document B.

Presentation

Rosemary Rowan read a summary description of regional categories, identifying the range of residential density allowed within them and making note of exceptions. She acknowledged that this needs to be filled in later, and that there will be more detail in actual land use framework. She also noted how the existing regional categories are similar to this and how the two of them relate. They are not exact matches but similar. Some of the differences between proposed regional categories and the old ones are that the old ones depicted where to put density and more urbanized development within the whole region whereas the new ones really focus on how you divide communities on a 'community by community' basis. It addresses the issue of "what is a community" and "how should it be developed?" She described the four regional categories that would be used to form communities: Village Core, Village, Semi-Rural and Rural Lands. She also described the category No Jurisdiction, which would be applied to major areas such as State Parks where the County has no land use jurisdiction. Transit Nodes is a specialized category that would be applied in limited areas in the County. Finally, the proposed Village Limit Line would define the edge of urban-level development, and would be associated with water/sewer service availability. Ms. Rowan acknowledged that the County understands that some communities will not match the abstract model because they only contain some of the categories, or because they have existing development patterns. However, it is the proposed model for future development. Showed Diagrams and Maps.

Questions

J. Phillips brought up that it is as though everything he has said before concerning village limit lines and urban limit lines was not heard. He referred to a statement in attached handout under the Village Limit Line section which states "pockets of semi-rural development may also be located within a village limit line where those areas are adjacent to village or village core and may be appropriate for future densification." Phillips said that statement must be eliminated. If it is not removed, then the categories do not apply to his represented areas at all. The statement must be removed because it is saying that anything within the village limit line that is less than two dwelling units per acre may be appropriate for future densification and just that statement in the handout document can be used for future general plan amendments. He further stated that if the County of San Diego chooses to go over with that statement, his community will be compelled to fight all plans in their community because the County of San Diego is basically saying "its not really a general plan, it's a plan for future densification." The urban limit lines are

essential in their present location because of mitigation for expansion of a sewer district, which is based on the current limit line as its positioned in the Valley de Oro planning area and in a lot of other planning areas. So, the lines cannot be 'moved' as they will violate the 2DU/AC definition. Therefore, there exists a quandary and if it is called a Village Limit Line and defined as noted, there is a problem. There is trouble for densification.

M. Beck notes for further clarification that the statement being discussed by Mr. Phillips is under 'Special Circumstances' on page 4.

D. Neirinckx raised his hand. He is skeptical about the Village Limit Line because things on the existing map have not been done before consulting with the community groups, and understand the need to go to the current density-based map, as it is a state regulation. Still, Mr. Neirinckx is concerned about the Village Limit Line changing from lot size to density-based as being a down zoning without the appropriate consultation with the local community planning group.

J. Chisholm mentioned his concern about preserving agriculture, posing the question: "How do you sewer or take care of services in a clustered area?" He suggested that it might be appropriate to have treatment plants or preserve more agriculture.

I. Holler responded to J. Phillips first. Ivan stated that when the County of San Diego establishes Village Limit Lines on maps, the desire was to do that with the planning groups in each community. So, in Valley de Oro there might not be any semi-rural land included inside the Village Limit Line. That might be the best solution or the only solution for Valley de Oro and other communities where that Village Limit Lines do not pick up semi-rural areas. On the other hand, there are communities that would incorporate some of the semi-rural areas with the understanding and agreement of that community that these areas might be appropriate to increase density. But those would be clearly identified in the beginning by working with the community. So, in Valley de Oro, Mr. Holler doesn't know that there is a need to incorporate any of the semi-rural areas. And to move the line would also require a general plan amendment.

J. Phillips: Responded to I. Holler's response stating that the problem is that in establishing this new concept of Village Limit Lines around areas of 2DU/AC overall density, the County of San Diego is doing away with the existing Urban Limit Line in the system, and that can't be done when that line has been used for major mitigation for growth inducement due to a required sewer expansion that serves some vast community. So, it is not where the Village Limit Lines are located within the community that concerns Phillips; it is that the real urban limit line encompasses more than will be encompassed by the Village Limit Line, and that creates the problem. The Urban Limit Line will be removed, and whether it is moved back or not sounds like something that supports the community's desires but does not. The sewers are already out to the Urban Limit Line, the Otay sewer extension is already out there. Also, the legal aspects of being able to take water districts to task for exceeding policy I-107 or I-109 of the County of San Diego on expansion beyond Urban Limit Lines is an issue. If the Urban Limit Line is moved to where its already been exceeded, then there is absolutely no validity in the policy that was established as a mitigation measure.

G. Pryor: Understands Mr. Phillips' point, and said that staff will look at the densification language issue.

M. Beck asked about the next issue, consultation, which Mr. Neirkinckx raised and which is the issue of communication with the planning group.

I. Holler responded to D. Neirinckx, and stated that it is staff's intention to work with individual Community Planning Groups to establish that line in each community.

D. Neirinckx understands what Mr. Holler is saying. However, in the past, with the map coming out, that he has not seen an appropriate response to the community's desires.

M. Beck raised the point that Mr. Chisholm raised about clustering and package treatment plants.

G. Pryor answered J. Chisholm by stating that the issue is already addressed by the Semi-Rural description. That description clearly says that if clustering will be used in a Semi-Rural area, one can in fact use municipal level services as long as overall density remains the same. It does not take that tool away.

R. Rowan stated that the County would not include those areas, detailed by Mr. Chisholm, in the Village Limit Line.

J. Ferguson: J. Phillips started out with the issue of language and then it became more general. The particular language that says "may be appropriate" bothered him. Mr. Ferguson asked J. Phillips if there was any way to amend that language, such as "not be appropriate" or "may never be appropriate", or does J. Phillips just want to erase the sentence?

J. Phillips states that the sentence is 'instigation'. Take the phrase out: 'may be appropriate'.

J. Ferguson understands Mr. Phillips' worry about the language.

J. Phillips agrees, as he has 'eaten' those kinds of words so many times.

Gil Jermont: Page 4, under Village Limit Line. The paragraph states that areas with only semi-rural and rural lands will not have a Village Limit Line. He would like to have a Village Limit Line because there are impatient cities on his borders. The Village Limit Line is one more fence that would clarify where the limit is.

M. Beck stated that Twin Oaks does not have a classic village core, which is the rationale that the staff was using. On the other hand, it sounds like the planning group wants to establish some very clear statements about their rural lands. Is there any practical way to write in language that will support the intent of their request?

R. Rowan stated that the County should look at a policy statement to address that issue.

I. Holler thinks that language could go into the text of the Community Plan, although the application of the Village Limit Line would be a jurisdictional boundary in this case.

M. Beck stated that this sounds like a commitment to work on policy language.

D. Van Dierendonck agreed with Mr. Phillips on his issue. The line "may be appropriate" could be rewritten to say "may not be appropriate", but that nullifies the whole thing and so why bother having it in the first place? He is also unclear as to the definition of the Urban Limit Line versus the Village Limit Line. He knows what an Urban Limit Line is, which is where the services stop. Ramona is currently faced with a school district, which wants to run a sewer line another mile, mile and a half. While it is not likely to be allowed, if that happens, there will be another 385

homes to the north. In that case, the communities need the ability to establish an Urban Limit Line that is not going to be “may be appropriate” for five years. So, he agrees with J. Phillips that it may be an automatic inducement to growth.

P. Brown wonders how this idea is applied to Julian, with its multiple, disconnected residential areas?

M. Beck thinks that the policy language has to be tested against the community plans, and that’s where the consultation has to happen. But Julian has a unique set-up.

L. Carmichael stated that we will have to look at every community individually and see what the existing country town is. Also, we’re going to have to do the best we can to surround those urban densities. Every community isn’t a perfect shape (pointing to places on the map)...

M. Beck asked if this will be defined on the community map?

L. Carmichael agreed that these lines will be determined per community plan.

Gary Pryor says that this is where part of the confusion is. Take out the editorial where it states, “may extend.” We don’t really need that. What we really need to do is try to find a boundary that states, “...this is where services will stop.” You are identifying the service core to your community, which is where the sewer, water and roads are. Now, if a school wants to run a (sewer) line through a part of the community without any rooftops, they won’t get any rooftops without a general plan amendment or without doing the EIR work all over again. So from that standpoint, they are used in combination. We also can go back to the language in the current plan, which talks about where urban development will not occur. So you can reverse it, which leaves it in the same context we’ve got today. That way you maintain the same position.

R. Lenac’s question relates to Page III. Rosemary described semi-rural lands as a transition area between village and rural lands, and that transition was from 1 to 10 acres. He believes that somewhere between when this was discussed last time and today, someone indiscriminately selected 40 to 160 acres. There is a huge gap between the transition of 1 to 10 acres and the sudden density of 40 to 160 acres. West of the CWA, the transition makes sense because the transition is from 10 acres to a density of 20-40 acres. West of the County Water Authority is okay, but east of the County Water Authority it is an indiscriminate transition. Mr. Lenac assumes the gaps came out of the Interest Group.

J. Russell stated that Ms. Rowan described the Transit Node off I-15 as the Hewlett-Packard property, and the land is much more than that. He asked that when circles are drawn on the map they be drawn more carefully, because in the past they were called ‘Blobs’. Those were not well defined and caused problems. Second, the Village Limit Line sounds like it does not have meaning. We are saying that we can put it around semi-rural as long as it is adjacent to the village. How do the Urban Limit Line and Village Limit Line limit development? The village near the Transit Node is about 18 miles away from the town core, yet we’re talking about some really high-density development. How does the village limit line do anything to limit that kind of development? Sounds like a meaningless thing.

G. Pryor stated that there is nothing to preclude using the Village Limit Line in the case of the Hewlett-Packard site and the adjacent lands. In essence, you’re creating almost a mini-village approach to that site. The line could be used to say that this is where we hold growth, which keeps it from creeping out of that area.

J. Russell stated the words “adjacent to the village or village core” do not mean anything.

G. Pryor stated that the words were general terms, and some areas have existing villages. You don’t want to start dropping anything unless it’s a ‘pre-planned’ approach.

J. Russell stated that he likes the idea of an Urban and Village Limit Line, but not the way it is described here. It has no teeth, and does not actually do something. County staff needs to go back to the drawing board.

M. Beck restated that Mr. Russell does not think the language matches up with the stated intent.

G. Pryor stated that staff will take it back and redefine it. We get the message.

R. Hensle asked if there is any answer on the Village Limit Line? Is there supposed to be one for each community? In the case of Lakeside, and Julian as well, we have pockets or multiple lines. I understand that we can incorporate the MSCP lands, which obviously won’t be developed down the road. But there are other areas that might be swept in, for example Blossom Valley/Eucalyptus Hills.

I. Holler stated that Mr. Hensle’s question correlates with J. Russell’s question. Holler can see in Lakeside that it might be possible to wrap one line that includes these (semi-rural) areas, and in other communities we may end up with a couple of these areas. The best County staff can do right now is go back and work on it.

R. Rowan stated that, in Lakeside, the Village Limit Line would not include Blossom Valley because it is located outside the developed area, as is Eucalyptus Hills.”

M. Price. The transit node map shows Alpine. Has the County of San Diego designated where they are looking in Alpine?

I. Holler stated ‘No’.

M. Price asked if staff have ruled out any areas or is it possible the transit node could be pushed out towards Viejas?

G. Pryor stated that Viejas is possible, but the County has not included or precluded areas.

M. Price remembered that Will Rogers used to have a line that said, “when Congress told a joke it became a law...” and I share the feeling that a lot of these folks feel here that when we put in language and call it “General Language”, it ends up becoming that which we live with. I’ve seen this happen recently with goals and standards. With Village Limit Line and Urban Limit Line we are arguing semantics. Mr. Price questions what it truly means and I would like to go on the record and say that Alpine would like our Village Limit Line to end at East Willows for a variety of reasons. He does not know if the County is going to change the language to allow that to happen, because staff said the planning groups would be the ones who draw the lines. So, County staff cannot say that the community can draw the lines as long as they draw the lines the way the County wants them. Mr. Price, with a unanimous vote by the planning group and an overflow crowd at our meeting, wants to state “please figure out how, if we go with this Village Limit Line concept, we can have it end at East Willows.”

G. Pryor, in response to Mr. Price, wants to go on record and say that there are planning groups, Interest Groups, and an independent department which has the ability to make an independent recommendation. We may or may not agree on some issues, and we will try to work through those. Ultimately, what we may have is your recommendation and the department's recommendation, which may or may not line up with it. Both will go through the Board and Commission. That is just part of the process. So, we (the County) will try and accommodate every community we can, but if we run into something that we as professionals feel is not going to work, then we're going to reserve the right to make that professional comment or decision.

J. Phillips stated, with regard to what G. Pryor just said, what happened to the grassroots? We started this process almost four years ago, and professional planners do not know the communities as well, especially our suburban communities. You can run a sewer line a couple of miles, and all the land in between can be held to what your general plan is. But that doesn't work, and it has been proven in Southern California hundreds of times, thousands of times. In Valle de Oro's planning area, for example, if there is a sewer and there is estate type residential or multiple-rural, it will increase in density within 3-5 years depending on economic times. Sewers are growth inducers. To say that they are not is not to understand the Southern California development cycle. Sewers come and then urban sprawl comes.

G. Pryor agrees with Mr. Phillips statement.

D. Van Dierendonck stated that the Regional Categories seem familiar. He asked if the Interest Group submitted these definitions.

G. Pryor responded "Yes."

D. Van Dierendonck distinguished between Village Limit Line and Urban Limit Line by saying that the Village Limit Line is more of a regional definition and the Urban Limit Line is more community specific.

Others clarified that it is, in fact, the opposite situation. The Village Limit Line is more community specific and the Urban Limit Line is more regional.

J. Chisholm expressed fear about a transit center in north-county. Mr. Chisholm doesn't want the transit center to accommodate a large population, such as University City. That's not the paradigm Mr. Chisholm is looking for, and transit centers don't have to accommodate a large population. The transit center might be a parking lot for the workers of the casino on Highway 76, and I don't need to house those workers or create a regional shopping center so they can buy things before they get on the train. Somehow, when I read this, I get the feeling that a transit center can be anything. We should look for opportunities to see what this might become.

I. Holler clarified that County does not anticipate a transit center, but rather a transit node with bus service, not a rail connection. He shares the concern of Chisholm, and it is not the intent or desire to do otherwise.

J. Russell brought up the point of Policy I-1, which states that if the planning group and staff disagree on a general plan amendment that those proposals are then required to go forward through the planning process. That is what Board Policy I-1 said. They (staff) have the right to their opinion. We (planning group) have the right to our opinion, and if we disagree staff has to take both points to the Board of Supervisors.

J. Ferguson stated that the policy does say that the planning groups are the lead agency.

J. Phillips restated the argument that the GP2020 process got turned around from what the staff originally presented to the board as a top-down process to a bottom-up planning process. The turnaround point came with essentially the same board of supervisors that exists now. The concept was not that staff works independently, but that staff brings forward what the community wants. He agrees with Mr. Russell on any given general plan amendment, but this is not that kind of project. This is a total rewrite of the general plan, and it is supposed to be ground-up. Mr. Phillips further said that both statements are true, and he was there when the changes happened. He was part of the group of people who made the direction of the process change, and now he is seeing it drift back the other way. He concluded by saying that when other subjects are discussed later, he will show more evidence of how it has drifted farther than we should tolerate.

M. Beck asked that dialog not go back and forth. M. Beck said that he can imagine, through an extreme example, that if a planning group wanted a 50,000-unit town created, then it would be expected that someone would say "wait a minute, we challenge that from a planning perspective." So, at some basic level there is a responsibility that resides at DPLU.

John Elliot asked to look at Page 4, which describes No Jurisdiction. Will that get a standard designation?

I. Holler responded that we will apply a designation to those lands.

Pat Brown agreed with the transition issue east of County Water Authority line.

Randy Lenac asked how did we get from a 1/40 to a 1/160 east of the CWA, as a definition of Rural Lands?

G. Pryor responded that the numbers came out of the Interest Group when they were looking at where growth could best be accommodated because of the County Water Authority line. It seemed most appropriate to put the density inside that line and to reduce the density outside that line. Pryor added that whether it (the designation) says 40 or 160 is up to everyone involved in the process. Ultimately, it will go through the commission and board.

R. Lenac asked if it is set in concrete?

G. Pryor answered 'No'.

T. Weber noted that in Borrego there is the special circumstance with agriculture, because of its dependency on ground water. In Borrego, homes are not a problem for water but agricultural growth is, as it uses 75% of the water. Basically, they use ground water to grow lemons to be ground up for cosmetics in Japan.

T. McMaster asked staff if they could clarify for him the residential density range for semi-rural and the residential density range for rural? There seems to be a gap between 1DU/10AC and 1DU/20AC. Why is that?

I. Holler said those are the density ranges that occur. There is no density range between 1/10 and 1/20.

G. Pryor added that there does not have to be a sequential order; there can be gaps. However, they can be adjusted so they overlap or one can leave gaps. In this case, there is a gap.

M. Beck opened the floor for additional questions on the current topics, and then announced Land Use Designations as the next item for discussion.

John Ferguson asked if J. Phillips accepted the distinction between Village Limit Line and Urban Limit Line, and asked whether or not he felt one can make that kind of distinction?

J. Phillips replied that he just wanted to make sure that the definition of a Village Limit Line encompasses putting that line where, in our suburban communities, the existing Urban Limit Line is and then just changing the name so that it does not negate the EIR mitigation for growth inducement that has been laid down for years.

John Ferguson reminded the group that the language needs to be defined.

M. Beck added that, with respect to the circumstance that J. Phillips is discussing, because the Urban Limit Line and sewer limit line is related to the mitigation measure that has its own line of reasoning and rationale behind it, he will try and summarize some of the agreements and changes that staff responded to. (#1) The “may be” will be removed from the language and (staff will make) a point of consulting with the planning group.

M. Price asked for a point of clarification about the phrase being removed.

G. Pryor interjected that he agrees with Mr. Phillips. He asked that staff take the whole paragraph out. He asked if this was clear to everyone, and then said that if the paragraph is taken out it solves Jack’s problem. Also, it doesn’t give us language that get us in trouble.

T. Webber cited a specific Borrego issue with a mobile home park (inaudible).

G. Pryor noted that this does not preclude anyone from identifying the area they want the line to go around, and to say “this is the municipal service area we want and we don’t want it to go beyond that point.”

M. Beck stated that staff will remove the second paragraph. There is also a commitment from staff to work on policy language for Twin Oaks that allows them to secure their boundaries to the extent they legally can. M. Beck also noted that maps should reconcile with language, and that staff should make a commitment to ensure that happens. Staff also should “deblob” the maps (transit nodes). He also addressed the issue about what happens after a sewer is extended, and said that maybe more work needs to be done that does not result in a rezone in those areas.

G. Pryor agreed that if you don’t put in a sewer line, then you don’t have a problem. In areas they (the County) can’t control, such as schools or independent districts, boundaries need to be set. Perhaps there is language that can anticipate school districts. What we need to do is to set boundaries.

M. Beck stated that maybe language can address particular issues, such as school districts. He addressed the issue of transit nodes, reiterating that it does not necessarily mean development

but rather a place to access transit. He concluded that those were the main agreements and issues heard, and asked if anything was missing?

J. Ferguson stated that if it comes to a vote, and we don't clarify Urban Limit Line and Village Limit Line, I can't vote yes.

G. Pryor asked if we can leave that issue off the table, because we may be able to use one definition to define both. If both are intended to do the same thing, lets get back to the old definition as the lines are intended to do the same thing. We are trying to simply use it more effectively in smaller areas. It isn't really urban if we are talking about the service area around Julian.

R. Rowan would like to note that in Lakeside, for example, the old Urban Limit Line would probably not be the same as the Village Limit Line. The community would probably not desire to have it remain the same because their Urban Limit Line includes one large area (a Semi-Rural neighborhood) that would not be included in a Village Limit Line. So, it depends on the community whether the old CUDA line is the Village Limit Line. It depends on the development patterns in the individual communities.

J. Ferguson understands that this is an important point, and that clarification is an absolute necessity.

G. Pryor asked if we can leave this issue on the table and get a better definition that everyone can agree with.

M. Beck asked if there is anything else on Regional Categories to be discussed before we get to Land Use Designations?

T. McMaster proposed that some places will have more than one Village Limit Line, and the language should recognize that.

M. Beck stated that we are acknowledging that situation.

Second Agenda Item: Residential Land Use Designations.

Presentation

R. Rowan: She started off with a discussion on residential designations, first pointing out how the proposed are different from the existing designations. She prepared a table that summarizes (see attached) how the old and new compare, and in many cases the only change is a name change. There is a different highest allowable density than what exists now. The current highest allowable density is 43DU/1AC (the old #9), and the proposed highest residential density for GP202 is 29DU/1AC. Therefore, in those communities that currently have the old 43DU/1AC on community maps, the community would reassign that area with the new density. The second difference is that the lowest allowable, proposed densities are lower than what is available today. The lowest today is 1DU/40AC, whereas the proposal includes lower densities of 1DU/80AC and 1 du/160AC. The yield reductions for slope are summarized, along with how they compare to the existing ones, on the table (page 7). Rowan noted that the current General Plan has yield reductions for slope only in its lower density designations, whereas the proposal is extend yield reductions for slope into the medium density range up to and including 7.3DU/AC. The highest densities, would are typically developed as duplex and multi-family

housing, would not have yield reductions for slope because they should not be located in areas where slopes greater than 25% exist. Or, if there are minor areas with slope, then staff recommends that language in the plan address design and grading issues. In the lower densities, staff is using the Steering Committee recommendation that yield reductions for slope stop at 1DU/20AC. That means all proposed residential designations ranging from 1 DU/10AC to 7.3 DU/AC would have yield reductions for slopes over 25% and further reductions for slopes over 50%. Today, only one designation (Residential #1) has yield reductions starting at 15% slopes; for all others the standard is 25% and 50%. Ms. Rowan did not discuss density based planning because the group has discussed it extensively. However, she did mention that the proposal is to identify parcel sizes in the zoning ordinance, rather than having parcel sizes related directly to a particular designation. The County will be looking at clustering policies, and she assumes staff will be bringing those back to the group at a future date. One advantage of clustering is that it provides a way maintain open space, such as agricultural land, and to reduce infrastructure costs. She also said that efforts were made to provide illustrate what residential density looks like, and those were shown in recent public meetings. If members wish to see that presentation, please let her know. What the presentation shows is that medium density residential use means single-family neighborhoods. The high densities, starting at 14.9 DU/AC, can be duplexes. Once you get into the 20 to 29 DU/AC range, those developments are typically two to three story multi-family complexes. Semi-rural areas will contain what is known as estate development, which is larger lots and lower densities.

Questions

J. Phillips reminded Mrs. Rowan that this group has been developing plans on clustering for some time. Perhaps she was not around when everyone agreed and Mr. Pryor agreed that clustering would be controlled in the community plan as to minimum lot size. As a matter of fact, the discussion cost Mr. Phillips bringing the community plan in line with GP2020's direction in order to restate its clustering requirement. So, if she is spending time developing policies that aren't going to agree with his and the others, then here it goes again...

G. Pryor acknowledged J. Phillips and the community's feeling with regards to clustering. It was agreed that clustering is an appropriate tool to use in certain instances with a 'density based' plan, but it does not have to be used.

J. Phillips noted that this leads to minimum lot sizes.

G. Pryor stated to Phillips that (min. lot sizes) are things he and the planning group can control.

J. Phillips stated that most of this County, because of the extreme hillside conditions and clay impregnated soil can, even with one acre lot sizes, drive the need for sewers and so one must be careful when writing a general policy. He also expressed that he does not think they can write one for the County, and that is why it is left up to the communities and hopefully they (the communities) are all doing what it takes to define what kind of clustering is acceptable. He thinks they came up with a blanket statement that is quite generous for using clustering, but the intent is that it is an absolute bottom restriction on lot size.

G. Pryor stated that, even if you are going to use clustering, you can still set a minimum lot size that is acceptable to the community.

M. Beck noted that on this point, because you have different types of communities, the community determines the minimum lot size and is attached to that policy.” He asked if that was clear to everyone.

R. Hensle asked to look at page 6, and said that the high density shows 14.5 to 29 and should show 10.9 to 29,

R. Rowan confirmed that it is a mistake. On page 6, where it says “high density”, the range should start at 10.9, not 14.5.

R. Hensle asked if we can go lower (in the Zoning Ordinance) than the Maximum allowable density?

R. Rowan said that yes, in terms of legal consistency, you can go lower. The designation is the maximum allowable density.

R. Hensle is concerned that when lot area averaging is used, public road standards should also be used. While he would support a private road standard, people tend to visit and park on the street, making it very congested. The road standard is too tight, and he is disappointed in the parking, street, and road standards. He would like to see those developed as we move along.

Dan Neirinckx asked about page 5, the lowest allowable density. It doesn't make any sense. What was discussed was whether or not we would do a reduction of density for anything below 1 DU/ 20 AC. The board already accepted the standard. We did not deal with these minimum densities, which are 80 and 160.

G. Pryor noted that this is a different issue. What was discussed is whether or not we would do reductions in density for slopes on designations below 1 DU/ 20 AC. We did not deal with the minimum density, which is the 1 DU/80 to 1 DU/160AC.

D. Neirinckx asked if we're stating that we are going to apply a slope restriction on a parcel, and the density would be no less than 1du/20? The 1 DU/40,80, and 160 does not apply.

G. Pryor noted that there is no density reduction proposed for 1 DU / 40,80, and 160 AC classifications.

D. Neirinckx stated that he understands, but recalls that the 1 du/40,80 and 160 designations were no longer being used by the Steering Committee.

Gary Pryor says, “No, that is incorrect.”

Dan Neirinckx noted that he will have to review the minutes for what we (the Steering Committee) had said.

J. Russell asked about two to three story structures. Will my town have a problem keeping two story structures?

R. Rowan noted that these are typical descriptions, only meant to identify what a typical density looks like. It is for the group's information, not a regulatory thing.

J. Russell asked about page 5, are we still operating under the theory that we have at least a partial role in the zoning plan?

G. Pryor answered yes, because each community is different and is going to want to tailor their lot sizes to what is on the ground in terms of existing neighborhoods. So, in each community we should have simple straightforward zoning that fits your community and that's the intent.

T. McMaster asked about Page 7, the categories that applied only to Valle de Oro and Lakeside. Mr. McMaster was bothered by the fact that Valley de Oro is on one side of and Lakeside on the other, and yet there are only two planning groups maintaining existing designations. He has trouble explaining this, and wants to go on record stating that either there should be no exceptions or he and his community should be included in exception.

R. Whitaker, in response to the proposal for Boulevard, said that their community would like 1/80 and 1/160. Also, they have a hard time telling the difference between lot size average and clustering. It seems to be one and the same. They have a project proposed now that will decrease density based on lot size averaging. That is not what is currently reflected in Rural Lands.

M. Beck asked the group for questions associated with "will there be a difference after this is adopted, and can the community set its own minimum lot size?"

R. Whitaker answered 'yes'. Is clustering a tool? It doesn't seem to correctly reflect what is currently zoned out there (inaudible).

G. Pryor answered that under the old plan, which is parcel based, someone is always looking for ways to adjust the properties in some fashion. Under density based planning, you do not need that. Quite frankly, we will probably recommend that we do away with 'lot size averaging' because if you have a density then you know how many rooftops are in your area. You can then use your zoning to set the minimum lot size. If someone wants to use clustering, they're going to have to go through a rezoning process to do that. It's not going to be a 'by-right' activity, and you can control where you do and don't want it. If you don't want it, you keep it out.

R. Whitaker noted that if someone comes in for development, they may not talk to us as a sponsor group. They may instead go downtown and talk to you guys, and we will never hear about it until it is already proposed.

G. Pryor stated that no, if its going to be a development like the one discussed, the project is going to come to you as soon as we (the County) get the application. As soon as we get them, the County sends the applications out to the planning groups.

M. Price asked if there is a way we can put an asterisk on (items like) lot sizes and building heights that says individual community plans can set minimums and maximums on maps, to make it clear these are not final. Is something on here that says your community plans will set this?

G. Pryor stated that there is a difference between General Plans and Zoning Ordinances, and what Price is discussing in terms of building heights, setbacks, and lot sizes are all terms of zoning ordinances. For those, there will be the chance to tailor items for a community. So in J. Russell's case, if he does not want three story buildings then that can be limited. If he does,

then it can be designated as to which parts of the community will allow 3 story buildings. It is up to the community.

M. Price wanted to note that there has to be a clarification here. It might be nice if there was an asterisk saying that we can establish individual limits for communities.

M. Beck stated that those are established by zoning, and there is a presumption of understanding about that difference. However, in the introduction it may be worthwhile to clarify that point.

D. Neirinckx referred to semi-rural density on page 7. Where did 1DU/16AC come from?

I. Holler noted that it is the slope reduction.

D. Neirinckx understands what is proposed, but wanted to know where the number actually came from?

G. Pryor explained that it is a mathematical formula based on maps and calculations.

D. Neirinckx understands, but he is trying to figure out where the number came from. Also, he noticed that densities were based on slope and placed east or west of the County Water Authority line. Were proposed densities based on water availability? Residents want to know how development will impact water resources.

M. Beck stated that there is a groundwater ordinance, so Neirinckx should measure his issue against the ordinance and see if there is a gap. But, he is right, in his area the community does bring that up every time there is a proposal.

D. Neirinckx wanted to know how the groundwater ordinance would be handled.

G. Pryor stated that it's a separate ordinance that will stay intact.

J. Phillips noted that VDO is essentially 95% built out. He expressed frustration over trying to apply a single density to any of those areas because it cannot be done. There are extremely steep slopes and valleys, and if you don't keep the 4, 8, 20 and cannot keep the 2, 4 on Estate Residential, the result is increased parcelization after the general plan is changed. So, the community is trapped if it is built out. He noted that this is a long-term argument.

R. Hensle noticed that there is no slope dependency on the higher densities, and wants to see it on that. Duplexes on a hillside without slope dependency look terrible. He then asked if high density was going to be allowed on slopes?

R. Rowan stated that, generally speaking, the proposal is not locating high densities where there are slopes over 25%. However, she and others will take a second look at the higher densities with regard to slope dependency.

J. Ferguson noted the Resource Protection Ordinance, and asked how much change this (the proposed designations) will have when compared to what can presently be done? It (RPO) covers the County of San Diego, and is a development standard for almost everything. He is not sure what differences are opened up, and is unsure whether the new system is a better system?

G. Pryor stated that RPO will stay as a separate ordinance, and we are looking at what categories to apply it to.

J. Ferguson requested clarification on RPO changes.

G. Pryor stated that there is no change to RPO.

T. Weber stated that density does not require excessive water in the desert. Borrego's concern is Agriculture, which takes 70% of the ground water.

G. Pryor acknowledged the comment.

T. McMaster again brought up the subject of VDO and Lakeside categories. While he is not critical of designations, Granite Hills needs to have the same consideration as Valley de Oro and Lakeside.

J. Elliot asked if RPO is in VDO and Lakeside only?

G. Pryor answered no, RPO is a countywide policy. He then asked if Lakeside is considering the new designations?

R. Hensle noted that a long time ago Lakeside stated they would not accept the new designations. However, they are now comfortable with them, and voted last Wednesday to accept the new residential designations.

D. Van Dierendonck stated that with all the designations, he feels that Ramona is slighted because nobody brought up anything that had to do with Ski Lakes.

(Inaudible questions about Land Use Designations, which is the next topic after the break.)

M. Beck summarized what he had as issues: (1) The issue of clustering and minimum lot size - He understood that the zoning will be customized for each community and that items such as minimum lot size will be done per those communities, (2) fix the typo on page 6, point 9, (3) high density on slopes, (4) address Borrego's special circumstance with respect to water availability and how it relates to residential density, and (5) work with Crest and Dehesa, especially in Granite Hills, to reconcile the designations. He asked if there were other issues and there were not.

Break.

Third Agenda Item: Non-Residential Designations

Presentation

R. Rowan: Started with commercial land use designations. The proposal is to retain general commercial, office professional, neighborhood commercial, and to add a new designation called rural commercial. The purpose of rural commercial is to provide flexibility in rural areas where potential land use conflicts are of less concern than in more populated communities. More work is needed to define Rural Commercial clearly, but the intent is to support the local needs of residents as well as traveling public in the rural areas. Language for service commercial identifies some of the problems with that designation, but it is still a proposed land use

designation. There are no proposed changes in industrial designations, but there may be some language added to Limited Impact Industrial regarding changes associated with the technology industry and language that allows mixed use in Limited Impact industrial areas. The County would like to phase out the Specific Plan Area, or SPA designation, and a SPA would not be identified until a developer comes in with a Specific Plan proposal. However, the department does acknowledge that there are many SPAs in existence that need to be addressed. Whenever possible, we would like to identify existing uses within SPA's using standard designations. For example, a SPA designation would be replaced by designations reflecting its residential, industrial, and/or commercial use. If there are no designations that match the existing SPA, then we would retain the existing SPA designation. One of our goals in this process is to have our community maps show what is actually happening in the SPA, including open space. Currently, all you see is the SPA designation, which often does not indicate what the actual use is. That is especially true for communities with SPAs that contain a significant amount of industrial, commercial, or dedicated open space. We would indicate the presence of an underlying SPA on the community map. This change in graphic technique would in no way change underlying legal agreements associated with a SPA. The proposal includes separate designations for tribal lands, military installations, and state parks and national forests. One proposed change is to divide public/semi-public into two parts, one for facilities and one for open space. This proposal was made in response to comments by this group at the last meeting. That way, you can tell when looking at a map whether the area is open space or a facility, such as a school. Those are two different types of public use. She also noted that "Impact Sensitive" is shown as a discussion item because some members of the group have concerns about eliminating Impact Sensitive. Basically, much has happened since the Impact Sensitive designation was introduced in the 1970's. There now is new information about natural resource and physical constraint locations, and both State and Federal laws have changed. Many of the issues once addressed by Impact Sensitive will be addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element. Other issues will be addressed through standards in the General Plan, such as floodplains. Also, the densities available for impact sensitive areas in GP2020 are actually more restrictive than the existing General Plan. Now, Impact Sensitive areas are assigned a density of 1DU/4, 8, 20 AC. Some of those areas will receive density designations that are lower than 1 DU/4, 8 20 AC, and in those cases sensitive areas will be more protected in the future than they are today. (See attachment B).

Questions

R. Rowan noted a typographical error on page 11, Impact Sensitive. The last sentence should read 1DU/4, 8, 20 AC and not 4, 8, 10 AC.

J. Ferguson asked if these changes are supposed to be equivalent, are the commercial and the industrial space equivalent to the present C's and M's? Are these replacements?

R. Rowan answered that they are the same.

J. Ferguson noted that we presently have, for example, C-31 and C-32, are these supposed to replace those?

G. Pryor noted that Mr. Ferguson is asking about zoning, which is different than the general plan classification. When the meeting comes back to zoning, planning groups will actually take a look at the community and decide what will be C-34 or C-36 for example, and redefine what is permitted in those districts.

J. Ferguson stated that there was a key point raised and hammered out previously on the M's and to some extent on the C's and that is the distinction, in terms of impact, on outdoor versus indoor. It was worked on very carefully to retain those previously, and now here they are gone. This is a critical issue, or it should be a critical issue.

G. Pryor stated that it is a question whether one uses it in zoning or in GP2020. It becomes limited in GP2020 because it cuts flexibility and it is difficult for different communities to try and apply it. In the zoning, communities can do exactly the same thing.

M. Beck noted that it is also listed in the limited impact industrial.

J. Ferguson stated that it should be limited because the impact is indoor versus outdoor, and that is the first element to look for in terms of impact in general versus limited. It needs to be in commercial as well because sometimes it is preferred to go to M-52 (light industrial) rather than more intense commercial uses that allow outdoor. That has happened in a lot of places. So, indoor versus outdoor also applies to commercial.

J. Ferguson also noted that some of the cities have designators with regard to different things, and if staff is going to do C-1, C-2, and C-3 they should discuss it with someone from the City. They will misinterpret it. This is just a side comment. Is there anything equivalent to these in the present general plan? Is this new category opening up?

G. Pryor asked if Ferguson looked at the numbers, those relate to what is in the books today.

J. Ferguson stated that sometimes the present language versus the community language strikes out some underlines and it has been heard that it is currently done. Is that true?

L. Carmichael stated that everybody has been given the land use element today.

G. Pryor stated that staff can do what is being requested.

R. Hensle stated that C-37, which is called service commercial, is really a heavy use that many times, especially in our community, seems to be right up against residential. And the type of impacts border on Medium/Heavy Industrial uses with open storage. Mr. Hensle's understanding is that C-37 was supposed to be eliminated in 1985, and he supposes people ran for the hills when no one came down and complained about it. Second, Mr. Hensle said that they (non-conforming uses) will probably be allowed to go along for some time. Is there a way of setting a deadline for these places being changed that can be applied? He knows that it was done in adult entertainment, that they had a 3-year sunset, or a grandfather clause time limit saying that its obnoxious since the community had changed and while it may have been appropriate years ago, the community had evolved and yet it (C-37) continued for so long because it was grand fathered until a sunset clause was applied. He'd like to see that applied to other uses. I can see the adult entertainment lawsuit, because they are the only one with a sunset or grandfather time limit clause, I can see the lawsuit setting up. We'd like to see that sunset applied to other uses.

G. Pryor responded by saying that an amortized period on that kind of activity can be done, and very typically there will be a limited time to stay and then the activity must leave. Adult entertainment is a policy question, and knowing Lakeside, the open storage yards they have will be used. They may have been appropriate twenty years ago, but they are not appropriate today because of growth and development that has occurred. It is a question of what zoning

classification can be put on it and it can be changed to one that does not allow open storage. However, then there is a need for language that says if that is being currently used then there is X number of years to amortize the business and move it. That can be done, but it just a question of drafting the ordinance and putting the correct zoning classification on it. That is something that staff should be looking at, in terms of developing the general plan, where the open storage is wanted and where it is not wanted. If it is really industrial, then classify them industrial and not commercial. That can take place by community, but it is going to have to be in general language in terms of how long something can stay in existence that applies uniformly like with Adult Entertainment where changing the zoning classification was done across the county. But, if it is being done on a 'community by community' basis, some may want open storage and some may not. It does need to be provided for someplace. We can't eliminate a use or activity.

R. Hensle, my understanding is that Lakeside has the most C-37 commercially zoned land anywhere. It may be service, but it is a service to the Industrial Land in the area.

G. Pryor recalls that, when this was first proposed, there was no service commercial as a GP2020 classification. That resulted in discussion here, and the group decided that they want to retain it (service commercial). Mr. Pryor is not married to the idea of keeping the service commercial designation. It can be done through zoning, taking what is called general commercial and tiering it from heavy commercial to light commercial activity within that classification through zoning.

R. Hensle stated that its not that the C-37 may not be necessary. The problem is where it's located. C-37 tends to be in residential areas.

G. Pryor stated that then it needs to be dealt with as plans are updated.

R. Rowan noted that staff earlier did an analysis on Heavy Commercial and determined that Heavy Commercial was actually a medium industrial use. And typically, commercial uses should not have the same (or greater) impact as industrial. That's the way most general plans and zoning ordinances work.

R. Hensle asked a second question. Is there a place in these new Zoning Regulations for something similar with neighborhood and rural commercial where someone might have a quasi-tourist business, such as a garden shop in a rural area, that then takes on other uses. Sort of a mini-cottage industry, with weekend classes or a garden area that sells other homemade goods. Does that type of business fit into the categories?

G. Pryor answered that it does fit, and there are enough categories in the general plan. It is just a question of what to do with zoning ordinances and how much flexibility is given to drafting the commercial zoning areas.

J. Chisholm asked about mixed use, specifically residential to commercial areas. Is it allowed by right, or how do we want to handle that? Is it being considered? What about Pauma Valley? How is the amount of commercial and industrial necessary being determined?

G. Pryor stated that when getting into mixed use, it is basically an overlay that is allowed after a hearing process. It really fits into the zoning ordinance as a tool, but not everyone will use it. You do not want to allow Mixed-Use by right because most of those things cannot be predetermined since they are unique to a specific area. So, provisions are made in the zoning

ordinance, and then if someone wants to use it they can tailor it to fit what they seek in terms of density for housing as well as types of commercial activity. It can be crafted to fit the area.

J. Chisholm asked how will it be monitored?

G. Pryor replied that it requires a public hearing process just like when rezoning a land.

J. Russell has three items. Concerning military installations, you have Pendleton-Deluz, and Deluz is not a planning area. Mr. Russell agrees with doing away with the SPA designation. He would like to see something that equates residential, commercial, and Industrial land use to the Transportation Node. He would like to see what is allowed there.

G. Pryor noted that Mr. Russell is saying he does not want heavy industrial in a transit node.

J. Russell does not know that, because it really depends on how the mix of uses plays out.

R. Whitacker asked if there is any way to take land designations such as commercial, general impact or service commercial and apply them to tribal land?

G. Pryor stated that the tribal lands are sovereign nations, so zoning regulations cannot be applied.

M. Beck asked if the county identified what is going on in the tribal lands?

G. Pryor stated that, in some cases, the County has knowledge of what is happening. In other cases, the county has no clue. The County of San Diego has asked tribes if they do have land use plans, and if we could have access to them, and in most cases the tribes have not responded to our request.

D. Neirinckx asked if a commercial residential mix can be combined?

I. Holler responded with a 'yes', and noted that staff is currently discussing allowing some mix of uses in commercial designations.

D. Neirinckx asked if it is one designation?

I. Holler answered 'Yes', although some parcels currently have split zoning. Is that what is being questioned?

G. Pryor answered, 'No,' he is talking about combined zoning not split zoning. There should be a clean separation between the two. In terms of mixed use, there should be a clean designation and it should either be classified as commercial or residential. If you want to mix residential and commercial, you need to use the mixed use overlay on a zoning ordinance on a case by case basis. That way there is no risk of getting trapped with a dual designation on one parcel. That gets to be very complicated in trying to set up a density for residential and then turn around and try to prescribe it as commercial.

D. Neirinckx stated an (inaudible) example.

G. Pryor stated tha, in that case, there is a parcel that is split zoned and the answer is yes, that line can be shifted and make it all one or the other.

M. Beck asked if we can make it a new one? There is a difference between split zoned and combined zoned and if that is desired, then staff is saying it can be done.

G. Pryor said yes.

J. Phillips asked are we just talking about commercial now? For Mr. Phillips, it seems as though staff has once again forgotten previous suggestions and he is concerned about a rewrite of the general commercial description to avoid the enclosure requirements that are in the current land use element. It is intended that use that is permitted within this designation be limited to commercial activity within a closed building. That is all the difference in the world to the communities. All are aware of a zoning enforcement problem. It is bad enough under the current definition, but if the definition is broadened so that anything is allowed, then it is really a problem because there will not be anything to enforce. What is not wanted in general commercial areas are things like equipment rental yards, car lots, and basic outdoor usage that are not the type of downtown environment that is wanted in a community. Currently, zoning ordinances are strict enough to keep shopping areas in downtown and he wants to keep them as the classic retail commercial use. This same discussion was had last time, and it is as if the County did not hear because service commercial is needed for areas like car lots, rental yards, etc and it was said that medium/heavy industrial activity is not what the current regional land use element is at all. It was mischaracterized what service commercial is supposed to be, and by doing that it is being made more and more to look like an undesirable community. There is a need for service commercial that isn't yet industrial, granted, historically that it has been poorly assigned throughout the county and abused throughout the county. Also, it is hard to get zoning enforcement to do anything about it. The service commercial areas are not large, but they are in a very important location and there is difficulty getting zoning enforcements to do anything. So, eliminating enclosure requirements is a problem.

G. Pryor responded that these are the basic land use classifications. If something that is going to have open storage is not desired, then that is the function of the zoning ordinance to clearly specify what is going to be permitted at a specific location. So, the zoning ordinance should be set up to reflect those desires. It sounds to Pryor as if there is a problem in the enforcement, which is the result of the zoning ordinance not being drafted well. It is not the general plan classification, but the zoning ordinance that is a problem.

J. Phillips understands what Pryor is saying, but if service commercial activity is opened into general commercial for all the areas that have been set up as general commercial, even if there is an effort to try to selectively zone it will be hard to defend a zone change because the general plan is not restricting the usage. A zone change will be hard to defend in front of the board of supervisors if the designation allows the uses proposed, even though their services are retail commercial. That is very important to Phillips and the community because it can create blight in a community very quickly, as it has created blight in Valle de Oro, Lakeside, and Spring Valley. Phillips knows that a lot of the staff does not want to hear too much on the topic, but it is very important because such a commercial blight can literally ruin a town.

G. Pryor asked if Mr. Phillips has a specific recommendation that would address that?

J. Phillips stated that it is already here. Leave general commercial and service commercial as they are, and if people have put service commercial in the wrong place, then make those changes. The characterization is overstating the aspects of service commercial as being like heavy (industrial). You cannot put a steel yard in a service commercial area.

M. Beck pointed out that this sounds like an issue that could take up the rest of the time. He suggested it be tabled, and that staff get back to the group about the process to be used to address the issue.

R. Hensle asked if C-37 is considered heavy, service commercial?

R. Rowan answered that based on the compatibility matrix, C-37, C-38, and C-40 are only allowed in service commercial areas so they are one and the same.

J. Ferguson asked if there is a compatibility matrix?

R. Rowan stated that it has been started but was not presented because staff needs to do more work on it. They understand the need for a matrix.

M. Beck asked if the group could finish this topic, and then table the discussion of SPA's and Impact Sensitive to the next meeting. They will be at the top of the agenda for the next meeting.

T. McMaster asked whether the visitor commercial has been folded into the C-4? I don't see C-26.

I. Holler stated that visitor commercial was previously discussed, and visitor commercial was pulled as a designation recognizing that it would be controlled through zoning.

T. McMaster asked a second question. A lot of commercial use has been allowed by an Administrative Permit. Mr. McMaster wanted a list of administrative permits that have been issued in the area over years, if that is possible.

L. Carmichael noted that the County of San Diego only has information on recent years, which have been computerized, where lists can be pulled up by community. Otherwise it would be a monumental effort to go all the way back.

T. McMaster needs to know permitting for areas of commercial establishments, for use when communities look at re-designating some areas.

D. Van Dierendonck agreed with Gary's proposal of a clean separation, but in looking at the first paragraph of service commercial, it implies that DPLU would like to get rid of the designation completely. That is a question.

DPLU staff stated 'Yes.'

P. Brown asked if there is a problem in Julian (inaudible) with commercial and residential designations?

G. Pryor stated that this is the problem when using dual designations. They are going to shift back and forth, so if the shift is unwanted then it should be either commercial or residential. Then, if someone wants to change it they have to change the general plan in terms of land use designation, which requires rezoning. If the basic use is residential but you want to allow an antique shop, that can be done through zoning as part of an accessory use or through another zoning technique. But we should still be looking at plan classification someplace in that process.

So again, zoning can be used as the tool to do that and then it is possible to limit the kinds of activities allowed in those places.

P. Brown noted the problem with 'the clown shop' in Julian which allowed commercial uses, not heavy, but allowed in residential buildings.

G. Pryor stated that accessory uses can be allowed through your zoning ordinance or technique. But, we still should be looking at a Plan Classification within that process. Zoning is the tool, and limit activities in those areas.

M. Beck stated that there is some process that will reconcile Julian's issues.

G. Jemmot asked if there is a plan for what happens with resort type SPA's, such as the Golden Door?

I. Holler stated that those can be covered under the visitor service zoning classification. In terms of general plan designation, it might be general commercial with specific zoning for visitor serving commercial. The designation could also be rural commercial for more rural areas.

G. Jemmot continued and asked if there was any way to keep it from turning into a Taco Bell, McDonald's, Denny's, or gas station?

I. Holler noted that once again, that is under zoning. He pointed out that the current designation called visitor serving commercial is matched by a visitor serving zoning regulation. It might also be appropriate to give it some sort of resort zone.

M. Beck suggested that for community specific issues related to commercial or mixed uses, attendees write down the specific issue stating "this is our issue and we want to understand how it will be reconciled". The communities should be very specific so that the answer will be satisfactory and the issue can be resolved. Otherwise, the same issues will arise.

J. Russell asked about the need to split service commercial in two. Fallbrook needs unenclosed areas for business, which is needed to provide for the local community. Discussed nursery related problem of storage.

J. Phillips does not want service commercial areas to be changed to industrial. The implication is that service commercial was never intended to be medium to heavy industrial. Maybe Ms. Rowan did not understand what heavy industrial is. It is important to have a general plan category, and it is the fourth time he has brought it up at meetings. What about the guy who comes along and wants a more intensive use than zoning allows, but the general plan does allow this. They will be able to do so. It cannot be defended in this County or at the board of supervisors. If the general plan does not prohibit what this person wants to do, then he will get the zone change. If zoning is relied upon, and the general plan says everything is ok, then to try and control it with zoning will result in a loss for the community by having the wrong types of commercial uses in unintended areas.

M. Beck suggested that ten till 12pm be reserved for public comments and that issues not addressed will be left for the beginning of the next meeting's agenda. That includes Industrial, SPA, Open Space, and Impact Sensitive. He recommends we table these items and take public comments for the next ten minutes.

Dutch Van Dierendonck Motioned to table further items on the agenda until the next meeting. Seconded by Tim McMaster. No oppositions.

Public Comments

Kevin Barmand (Harmony Grove) stated that we are not in a planning group, yet there is a 6000% increase in density proposed in the Harmony Grove area. The community drafted a private plan and wanted to make the group aware of the need for changes in the proposed map. The community-drafted map reflects a 300-500% increase in density- what we consider a far more reasonable density increase. We want to come up with a plan of our own.

M. Beck noted that the issue is that the community has no official representation, and how do they engage in this process?

I. Holler responded to the concerns by reassuring them that he is aware of the concerns. As DPLU continues in the process of making refinements to DPLU map, most if not all issues will be addressed in the context of meetings by the San Dieguito planning group.

M. Beck questioned if it was appropriate for somebody from that group to participate in the process even if participating from the audience?

I. Holler stated that they have the opportunity to participate via meetings from San Dieguito planning group even though they are technically not in the planning group area.

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks) stated that Alternative 3 was not adopted. He does not care for any maps, as they do not serve the community and all he hears are that problems can be taken care of in zoning and that they are a result of a poor zoning ordinance. He wants to see a solution to how things will work hand in hand. Also, the slope categories of 0-15% are being eliminated and extended to 0-25% and he wants to see the numbers that such decisions are based on.

Jim Russell (Fallbrook) asked about people who go into planning groups that do not represent their areas, specifically Harmony Grove and the San Dieguito area. Could they indemnified, the San Dieguito Planning Group, in the case of a lawsuit in Harmony Grove?

Tom Harron noted that yes, they could be, and that Harmony Grove might become part of the San Dieguito area.

Bruce Graves (Palomar Mountain Planning Group) stated that he represents a small community, which used to have a commercial area of 6 acres that included a general store, restaurant, and post office. Due to the Forrest Conservation Initiative (FCI), it was down zoned to a notch above residential and he is concerned that if the existing facilities burned down, it would be difficult to replace them. They could only replace them if the County of San Diego did them a favor and designated them as a country town. In FCI, it does not mention newly designated country towns. Mr. Graves does not think it is necessary to wait until 2010 to solve the problem, since after FCI sunsets it will be too late.

Tom Harron (County Council) agreed, but unfortunately the only way to amend an initiative is to go out for a vote. Unfortunately, we cannot change legislation passed by initiative.

M. Beck asked if the County had the ability to designate a place a Country Town, and remove it from FCI?

T. Harron stated that the FCI does not give the ability to designate Country Towns. Specifically, FCI sets forth what country towns are and has provisions for what you can do to expand them, but not to add new ones.

Bruce Graves stated that FCI does not say you cannot add new ones.

M. Beck asked if Mr. Graves needs to meet with council concerning this issue. Meeting closed, but briefly suggested that G. Pryor or staff come back and explain with examples the relationship between general plan and zoning ordinance. He asked that staff specifically address issues that Mr. Phillips raised, such as consistency with the general plan and inconsistency with zoning and how those will be reconciled.

G. Pryor set the next meeting for July 13th at 9:00 AM.

Meeting adjourned.